

Summer 5-23-1973

## Senate Meeting May 23, 1973

Academic Senate  
*Illinois State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting May 23, 1973" (1973). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 169.  
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/169>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact [ISUReD@ilstu.edu](mailto:ISUReD@ilstu.edu).

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

May 23, 1973

Vol. IV, No. 16

Contents

Approval of Minutes

Administrator's Remarks

Technical Changes in the ISU Constitution

Committee Appointments

SCERB Proposal

Resolution

Committee Reports

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.



## ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

May 23, 1973

Vol. IV, No. 16

### CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Edwards in Stevenson 401 at 7:07 p.m. The Secretary called the roll to see if a quorum was present. The Chairman declared a quorum to be present.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

IV, 123

Mr. Brundage asked for a correction in the May 9 Minutes. In the correction of the previous minutes of the April 25 meeting, Mr. Brundage was recorded as voting no on motion 114 when he should have been recorded as abstaining. A motion (Mr. Rogers, Mr. Johnson) to accept the minutes as corrected by Mr. Brundage was approved.

### ADMINISTRATOR'S REMARKS

Dean Budig reported on developments re the Academic Conference (AACMU). He reminded the Senate that last winter Mr. Hill and Mr. Hubbard had recommended that we examine the benefits of continued membership in the Academic Conference with various other schools in the Midwest. Dean Budig recommended that we remain a member of the Academic Conference for at least one more year. He stated that this group may be on the verge of garnering some important federal grants. In answer to the question of how much it costs for Illinois State to belong to the conference, Dean Budig reported that it costs approximately \$13,000 for our participation.

Dean Budig responded to a memo from Chairman Edwards in which Mr. Edwards had requested that Mr. Hathway be employed during the summer on a part-time basis to work on the By-Laws and committee structure of the University. Dean Budig said he had discussed this proposal with the Executive Committee and had approved of the move. He reported that Mr. Hathway will be retained on a part-time basis for the summer.

The Chairman reported that Ms. Freyberger has been appointed to SCERB and Mr. Kurz has been reappointed to the Athletic Council by the President.

### ACTION ITEMS

#### OLD BUSINESS--TECHNICAL CHANGES IN THE ISU CONSTITUTION

The Senate moved to the first action item - the Committee for Constitution and Governance Review Report. Mr. Cetwinski requested a clarification of the relationship between the Senate and the CCGR. He reported that in the article in today's VIDETTE it was reported that the CCGR was telling the Senate what they had to do. The Chairman cautioned the Senate against acting on reports from the VIDETTE rather than from direct communication from the committee.



The Chairman clarified the role of the CCGR and that they were to report to the Senate, to the President, and to the entire University community. Mr. Eimermann from the CCGR stated that Mr. Hathway would also be working with their committee as part of his assignment on the committee structure.

The Senate began consideration of item 8.

*Item 8 Article III, Section 4 B 2*

*Delete:*

2. *Where termination of appointment is based upon financial exigency, or bona fide discontinuance of a program or department of instruction, Section 5 will not apply, but faculty members shall be able to have the issue reviewed by the Academic Senate, the President, or both. In every case of financial exigency or discontinuance of a program or department of instruction, the faculty member concerned will be given notice as soon as possible, and never less than one year in advance, or in lieu thereof he will be given severance salary for twelve months. Before terminating an appointment because of the abandonment of a program or department of instruction, the University will make every effort to place the affected faculty member in another suitable position. If an appointment is terminated before the end of a period of appointment, because of financial exigency, or because of the discontinuance of a program of instruction, the released faculty member's position will not be filled by a replacement within a period of two years, unless the released faculty member has been offered reappointment and a reasonable time within which to accept or decline it.*

*And substitute the following:*

2. *Where termination of appointment is based upon financial exigency, or bona fide reduction or elimination of a program or department, Section 5 will not apply, but faculty members shall be able to have the issue reviewed by the Academic Senate, the President, or both. In all such cases the faculty member being displaced will be given notice as soon as possible after the decision to reduce or eliminate has been made. Such notice shall be given to tenured faculty at least twelve months before the end of the academic year in which the faculty member is to be terminated. Notice for non-tenure appointments shall be given according to the dates established in Article II, Section 2 B 2. Before terminating an appointment because of the reduction or elimination of a program or department, the University will make every effort to place the affected faculty member in another suitable position. If an appointment is terminated*

*before the end of a period of appointment, because of financial exigency, or because of the reduction or elimination of a program or department, the released faculty member's position will not be filled by a replacement within a period of two years, unless the replaced faculty member has been offered reappointment and a reasonable time within which to accept or decline it.*

Mr. Tarrant raised a question about the two-year waiting period before filling an eliminated position. Mr. McConnell raised a question as to whether the dates which are provided for in the Constitution were followed in the notification of non-reappointment this year. Dean Budig reported that to the best of his knowledge they had been; that the answer is "yes" to Mr. McConnell's question.

The Senate turned to item 9.

*Item 9 Article III, Section 5 A*

*Delete the present section:*

*As a part of its bylaws, the Academic Senate shall adopt a procedure for handling faculty academic freedom and tenure cases, including faculty dismissal cases, which guarantees academic due process and which conforms to nationally recognized standards. To implement this procedure, the bylaws shall provide for an Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, constituted of faculty members with tenure and elected by the Academic Senate.*

*And substitute:*

*The Academic Senate shall adopt bylaws which shall provide for an Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee constituted of faculty members with tenure and elected by the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate shall adopt a procedure for handling faculty Academic Freedom and Tenure cases, including dismissal cases, which guarantee academic due process and which conform to nationally recognized standards. Specific academic freedom and tenure case decisions shall be forwarded to the President.*

Mr. Eimermann raised a question whether or not the Constitution should contain this specific a language. Mr. Mead stated that his interpretation of the change is to take away the determination away from AFT and move it to the President. Mr. Scott Eatherly, Chairman of AFT, spoke on behalf of the Committee. He discussed a communication on the change (See appendix). Mr. Madore pointed out that the changes in the policy would probably increase court cases. Mr. Eatherly reported that there were two recommendations from the AFT Committee: 1) a revision leaving the document as general as it presently is or 2) adding "transmitting to the Board of Regents"

to the last sentence of the proposed change. Mr. Fuess stated that there was some confusion here because there was no item 10 on the changes and that this possibly dealt with the AFT. The Committee agreed to reconsider the criticisms that have been raised on this article and also to clarify the absence of section 10. Mr. Mead pointed out that we are radically changing the nature of the original proposal because we are suggesting that the final interpretation of academic freedom and tenure will lie not in the judgment of one's academic peers but is once more removed. He recommended that we not even forward these decisions but keep them within the academic peer group. The Committee asked for a straw vote on the various propositions: 1) leave the same 2) add "transmit to the Board of Regents." The sense of the Senate was to adopt the revision, striking "specific freedom and academic issues shall be forwarded to the President."

The Senate moved on to item 11.

*Item 11 Article III, Section 6 C*

*Add the word "recommendations" in sentence two, and substitute the words, "forwarded to" for "received by" so that the new section will read as follows:*

*C. Faculty Status Committee*

*The Academic Senate shall adopt legislation which shall provide for a Faculty Status Committee, consisting of faculty members. Detailed policy recommendations as to the handling of faculty appointments, promotion, salary, and tenure matters shall be approved by the Academic Senate. Specific appointment, promotion, salary, and tenure recommendations from the Faculty Status Committee shall be reviewed by the faculty members of the Academic Senate and forwarded to the President.*

*Rationale for change:*

*F.S.C. cannot make the actual policy itself. It can only advise.*

Mr. Smith called for leaving the wording "received by the President" in the Constitution and not substituting "forwarded to the President." Mr. Champagne pointed out that the President could in fact create an ad hoc committee at any time to undo the work of the Faculty Status Committee. Mr. Eimermann agreed that this was possible. It was pointed out that the President has on some occasions stated that he is in disagreement with the entire Faculty Status process and is desirous of changing it. Mr. Mead suggested that we not make the constitution a legal document but let the legal complications be settled at another level. Mr. Fuess pointed out that the FSC procedures were always intended to be advisory to the President. He stated that as a member of the FSC he has tried many times to educate the Senate and the University Council that the FSC recommendations are only advisory to the President and may be changed by the President. Mr. Edwards turned the gavel

over to the Vice Chairman in order to speak as a Senator. Mr. Edwards spoke in support of a change to the words "forwarded to the President"; he argued for the clarification which would eliminate a certain amount of vagueness. Mr. Merker spoke to the problems that were raised by limiting the faculty to matters of FSC. In answer to a question from Mr. McConnell as to why changes in student input made by the Board were not included under this revision, the committee members stated that the decision about student input was relegated to phase two of the revision. Mr. Young reminded the Senate that in the recent North Central evaluation report the APT procedures had received a great deal of praise and that the attempted changes simply tried to clarify the situation. Mr. McConnell reminded the Committee that the technical changes were to bring the constitution into line with the Blue Book and that they have not been brought into line. Mr. Champagne pointed to another section of the Board policy which states that faculty members make decisions on salary, promotion and tenure. Ms. McMillan stated that we were probably not in line with the Board policy in the Green Book originally. The question of whether or not students would be included in the FSC processes will be studied by the CCGR in phase two of their deliberations.

The Senate moved to item 12.

*Item 12 Article III, Section 6 E*

*Change the old:*

- E. Sabbatical Leave and Leave Policy  
The Academic Senate shall adopt legislation which provides for a sabbatical and other leave policy for the faculty.*

*To read:*

- E. Sabbatical Leave and Leave Policy  
The bylaws of the Academic Senate shall provide for faculty participation in the formation of policies on sabbatical and other forms of faculty leave.*

*Rationale for change:*

*The Senate does not have the authority to legislate leave policies. The Board has already done that.*

No questions were raised about this clause.

The Senate moved on to item 13.

*Item 13 Article IV, Section 1 A*

*Add the following statement as the second item in the list of presidential responsibilities and renumber items 2 through 9 as 3 through 10.*

2. *Implementation of protections afforded faculty, students, and staff in this constitution and provision of administrative structures to serve those needs.*

*Rationale for addition:*

*Because the specific job descriptions of the Dean of Faculties, Dean of Student Services, etc., is eliminated, it is important that someone be assigned their responsibilities.*

Mr. Eimermann of the CCGR stated that they would not include the specific wording, but would change the item to include civil service and administration. No questions were raised on this item.

The Senate moved on to item 14.

*Item 14 Article IV, Section 2 B*

*Eliminate the last sentence:*

*Procedures for the selection and appointment of administrators shall be specified in legislation enacted or approved by the Academic Senate.*

*And substitute:*

*The Academic Senate may recommend procedures for the selection and appointment of administrators.*

*Rationale for change:*

*Senate cannot determine the policies, only recommend.*

Mr. Tarrant recommended that the word "may" be changed to "shall."

The discussion of the CCGR Report ended for this meeting. The Chairman recommended that the Committee come back with new wording incorporating the changes that have been recommended by the Senate in their discussion. Mr. Sutherland raised a belated point about the inclusion of the evaluation of administrators in the new constitution. Mr. Eimermann suggested that this was to be included in phase two.

The Chairman thanked the Committee for coming; he also thanked Mr. Eatherly for providing input into the Senate deliberations.

#### NEW BUSINESS

#### COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

IV, 124

The Athletic Council student nominees were read. A motion (Mr. Brundage, Mr. Liberta) to transmit these to the President was approved with Mr. Johnston abstaining. The list of appointments to the Reinstatement Committee was

IV, 125

read. A motion (Mr. Kagy, Mr. Wieck) to approve these appointments was approved.

IV, 126

Civil service appointments to the Parking Committee and the Economic Well Being Committee were read. A motion (Mr. Kaqy, Ms. Little) to receive the civil service appointments passed. The Chairman will transmit the nominations to the President and notify the proper committees of the appointments.

#### SCERB PROPOSAL

Mr. Schwelle requested that the Chairman postpone the item on the method of selection of SCERB Board members. The item was postponed without objection.

#### RESOLUTION

Mr. Sutherland raised an item which he thought needed Senate attention. Mr. Sutherland read a statement providing background information for the sense of the Senate resolution which he requested:

"A matter has come to the attention of some Senators which is so serious in both its substance and implications that it demands immediate clarification by those responsible.

Within the last two weeks, apparently, Richard Godfrey, Director of Information Services, sent a memorandum to certain members of the Central Administration asking them to collect certain data on the activities of their staff personnel and report back to him. This memorandum has not circulated widely; there seem to be no copies available outside the hands of those few who received them through official channels.

The gist of the memo would seem to be, from hearsay evidence of those who've read it and from the rumor mill, as follows:

It is reported to state that:

University personnel have been harassed by a Pantagraph reporter;

That much work time has been taken up by staff talking with the press;

Chief administrators are asked to study situations in their areas and report to Richard Godfrey: 1) how much Pantagraph harassment there has been; 2) which staff members have been talking to the press; 3) how frequently; 4) how much time has been spent by them in talking to the press; 5) have there been reporters' telephone calls at late and inconvenient hours.

The Administrators are asked to supply their data to Godfrey for him to prepare a report for the President.

I repeat: this would seem to be the gist of the memorandum as reported from a variety of hearsay and rumor sources. Only those few who have read it know the contents precisely. Some of the administrators who received this memorandum are quite disturbed by it, and have directly or indirectly expressed their concern



to friends on the faculty; some have kept silent. Several faculty members have seen the memorandum to read it,--though I for one have not seen it--and they are equally disturbed.

The following reactions have been expressed by those who have read the memo: 'Administrators are being asked to spy on the activities of their staff personnel and report on their contacts with representatives of the news media.' 'It's like something from 1984.' 'It's an attempt to intimidate and silence University personnel.' 'It looks like a case is being built to discredit the news media and whatever reporting they may engage in concerning ISU.' 'Somebody's fishing to find the leaks, and it's not Dick Godfrey.' 'A reasonable person would be warranted in assuming there is an attempt to surveillance and monitor the activities of staff.'

If the memorandum indeed has the content indicated above, it seems antithetical to the spirit of free inquiry and open communication which the University is committed to support. Moreover, the perceptions of people who've read it are that it is an intimidating and chilling document antithetical to civil liberties and a vehicle for the operation of clandestine surveillance. At least one person is of the opinion that it is designed to provide data for the discrediting of the news media in their fulfillment of their reporting function. As it emerges in the absence of an opportunity for people to see and read it in itself, it smacks more of Watergate than a free University.

Therefore, since the rumor mill is a dangerous thing; and since--if it is as unfortunate as it is reported to be, we should know it; and if it is not as sinister as it would appear, we should be able to determine this also, we call for a sense of the Senate resolution:

- 1) that Richard Godfrey supply the Senate with copies of the memorandum in question for the Senate's perusal;
- 2) that Richard Godfrey supply the Senate with copies of the report compiled from the data collected from members of the Central Administration as soon as it is completed.

The statement was supported by Ms. Chesebro, Mr. Fuehrer, Ms. Lindstrom, Ms. McMillan, Mr. Madore, Mr. Merker, Mr. Stoner, Mr. Sutherland, and Mr. White.

IV, 127

A motion (Mr. Tarrant, Mr. Smith) to suspend the rules in order to consider the resolution was unanimously approved. Mr. Sutherland restated the resolution. Chairman Edwards asked if it was not wise to have someone investigate this matter to verify the existence of such a memo and then request such information. Mr. Sutherland replied that the memo had been examined by several faculty members. Mr. Mead suggested that the phrase "under whose authority this document was sent out" be added to the resolution. Mr. Scott Eatherly commented on the document which he had read. He commented on his belief that such a document would interfere with the academic freedom of the faculty, civil service, and students. At this point Mr. Barford stated that he would state the question that no doubt was in everyone's mind, "Did the President really know?"

Mr. Sutherland stated that this is a serious question. If Dick Godfrey was not the one that thought it up and sent it out, then he may very well refuse this request.

IV, 128

The motion (Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Mead) to accept the resolution as amended by Mr. Mead was unanimously accepted. In its final form the resolution reads:

- 1) That Richard Godfrey supply the Senate with copies of the memorandum in question for the Senate's perusal;
- 2) That Richard Godfrey inform the Senate regarding the authority under which the memorandum was issued; and
- 3) That Richard Godfrey supply the Senate with copies of the report compiled from the data collected from members of the Central Administration as soon as it is completed.

#### COMMITTEE REPORTS

Executive Committee - Mr. Merker reported for the Executive Committee.

Academic Affairs - Mr. Champagne stated that the Committee was meeting and trying to get its feet on the ground.

Administrative Affairs - A meeting for Wednesday, May 30 was announced. Mr. Barford raised a question about the information on the Vice President for Finance candidates that the Senate has been receiving. The Chairman explained that the Executive Committee had chosen four people to meet with the candidates in an in-depth interview. A time when anyone from the Senate can come and meet the candidates was provided at the afternoon reception. The Chairman stated that evaluation sheets were available so that your comments could be made known to the Selection Committee. Mr. Champagne stated that he had been chairman of the Dean's Selection Committee. He related to the Senate the disappointing turnout at the receptions and urged the Senators to attend and meet the candidates.

IV, 129

IV, 130

Student Affairs Mr. Cetwinski called attention to the memo on University Record Policy and Administrative Withdrawals. It is now an information item. It is important that this be acted on as soon as possible so that it can be in the new Handbook. It was explained that the Senate could by passing a resolution after unanimously suspending the rules authorize the Executive Committee to act for the Senate on this item. A motion to suspend the rules (Mr. Cetwinski, Mr. Barford) was unanimously approved. A motion (Mr. Cetwinski, Mr. Barford) to ask Executive Committee to act on the University Record Policy and Administrative Withdrawal policy was made.

The Chairman stated that he would like each Senator to look into the document carefully and make a response known to the Executive Committee. Mr. Tarrant asked if this is what Mr. Goleash wants or is it what the students want. Ms. Chesebro raised the question of reporting responsibility. Mr. Roderick raised the question of guarantee of students rights. Ms. Chesebro emphasized that the report should go beyond the decision makers.



A discussion as to exactly what kind of information was involved in the records policy and whether faculty needed this information for their advisement duties was held. Mr. Tarrant suggested that an addition should be made so that students could get information from their own records.

The question was called for. The resolution would refer the matter to the Executive Committee to act in this matter. At this point concern was voiced that this was not really the sense of the Student Affairs Committee on this matter. Mr. Barford stated that this is a very important policy and with the changes in this document it should be considered before the whole Senate. Mr. Cetwinski and Mr. Barford agreed to withdraw their motion (IV, 129) so that the matter could be discussed at a later Senate meeting.

Mr. Cetwinski asked if the Union Investigation Committee was responsible to make a report to the Senate as a whole or to the two committees involved. The Chairman replied that the report would go to the internal committees. Mr. Cetwinski requested that the Union Investigation Committee be dissolved. Mr. Merker suggested that Mr. Cetwinski report the findings of the committee and then protocol would be followed.

The Chairman asked members of the Senate to complete the summer address form. In this way information could be sent to the Senators during the summer.

The Chairman reminded the Senators of the coffee tomorrow for the Vice President for Finance candidate.

IV, 131

A motion (Mr. Barford, Mr. Rogers) to adjourn was approved. The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

For the Academic Senate,

Charles R. Hicklin, Secretary

CRHp1

NAME	ATTEN- DANCE	VOTE							VOICE VOTE		
		Motion # 124	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion No.	Yes	No
Master	P*								123	X	
Barford	P								124	X	
Brundege	P								125	X	
Cetwinski	P								126	X	
Champagne	P								127	X	
Chesebro	P								128	X	
Clifton	P								129	X	
Duty	P								130	withdrew	
Edwards	P								131	X	
Ficek	A										
Friedberg	P										
Fuehrer	P										
Harpole	P										
Hicklin	P										
Johnson	P										
Johnston	P	Abst.									
Kachur	P										
Kagy	P										
Liberta	P										
Lindstrom	P										
Linne	P										
Little	P										
Madore	P										
McMillan	P										
Mead	P										
Mensing	P										
Merker	P										
Potter	P										
Rennels	P										
Rex	P										
Roderick	P										
Rogers	P										
Smith	P*										
Stein	P										
Stoner	P										
Sutherland	P										
Tarrant	P										
VanTine	P										
White	P										
Wieck	P										
Wissmiller	P										
Workman	P										
Wong	P										
Woods	P*										
Ing	P										
McConnell	P										
Berlo	A										
Budia	P										
Johnson	A										

\*Arrived after roll call